UNITY

FREEDOM FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor 1880-1918)

Editors

John Haynes Holmes Francis Neilson

Are We Solving the War Problem?

By JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

John Burroughs' Nature God

By EDWARD ARTHUR ROCKWOOD

In the Psychic Field

By FREDERICK STARR

VOLUME LXXXVIII NUMBER 21

Chicago, February 2, 1922

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

(Established 1878)

Subscription, $3.00 per Annum

A Journal of the Religion of Democracy

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES *: Editors :* FRANCIS NEILSON

UNITY Fellowship

FRANK C. DOAN
CHARLES F. DOLE
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
HENRY R. MUSSEY
FRANCIS NEILSON
EDMUND H. REEMAN
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
ANNA GARLIN SPENCER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Managing Editor

EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

ROBERT COLLYER, Chicago. WM. C. GANNETT, St. Paul.
JENKIN LL. JONES, Janesville. C. W. WENDTE, Cincinnati.
J. C. LEARNED, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

FRANCIS L. ROBERTS, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. SUNDERLAND, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
GEO. W. COOKE, Grand Haven, Mich., - } "Notes and News."

Editorial Contributors

Charles E. Beals
Harry Foster Burns
Charles W. Casson
George Willis Cooke
Percy M. Dawson
James Waldo Fawcett
Zona Gale
Emil G. Hirsch
Chester Lloyd Jones
David Starr Jordan
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
James H. West

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—Charles Strong
CANADA—Sidney Snow
ENGLAND—Fred Hankinson
E. D. Morel
Walter Walsh
FRANCE—G. Demartial
Romain Rolland
INDIA—Rabindranath Tagore
RUSSIA—Alina Huebsch
(To be enlarged)

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, January 12, 1899, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

UNITY Fellowship Associates

BOND OF UNION

We, the undersigned, believing in the association of all men and women who are in sympathy with the aims and ideals set forth in the Announcement printed November 3rd, 1921, do invite all who wish to co-operate to join in a world-wide fellowship that has no bounds of race or creed.

The name of this fellowship is The Unity Fellowship Associates and its purpose is the interpretation of the Religion of Democracy. Membership means a declaration of sympathy and interest. There are no dues. Members may make voluntary contributions which will be used for the purpose of making known the aims of the Fellowship and the publication of its literature.

UNITY will be the organ of this Fellowship and all members will be requested, though not compelled, to be subscribers.

Lists of the members will be sent to all members so that they may be known to one another. Local groups may be formed wherever there exists a sufficient number and there is the desire to do so.

All persons who desire to become members may do so by sending their names to UNITY, care of Abraham Lincoln Centre, Chicago, Ill.

Name .....

Address .....

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

To UNITY PUBLISHING COMPANY,
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago.

Gentlemen:

Enclosed you will find check for which please enter my subscription to UNITY for one year.

Mr. (Mrs. or Miss)_____

Address _____

Rates: $3.00 ($3.50 in Canada; $4.00 in other countries) for a year's subscription. Single copies 10 cents.

Contents

EDITORIAL—

Notes 323
Are We Solving the War Problem?—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 325

ARTICLES—

John Burroughs' Nature God.—EDWARD ARTHUR ROCKWOOD 331
The World's Great Rebels and Heretics. V. Spartacus, the Gladiator Strike-Leader.—ROLAND D. SAWYER 333

THE STUDY TABLE—

In the Psychic Field.—FREDERICK STARR 333

POETRY—

The Warrior Wind.—*Ralph Chaplin* 323
Beauty Like Dawn Shed Over Me.—*Blanche Shoemaker Wagstaff* 330
To John Burroughs.—THOMAS CURTIS CLARK 332
The Ways of Truth.—VICTOR E. SOUTHWORTH 333
Faith—Hope—Love.—WALTER DANIEL 334

THE FIELD—

News of India.—TARAKNATH DAS 335

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOL. LXXXVIII. THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1922 NUMBER 21

THE WARRIOR WIND.

Once more the wind leaps from the sullen land
With his old battle-cry,
A tree bends darkly where the wall looms high;
Its tortured branches, like a grisly hand,
Clutch at the sky.

Gray towers rise from gloom, and underneath—
Black-barred and strong—
The snarling windows guard their ancient wrong;
But the mad wind shakes them, hissing through his teeth
A battle song.

Oh, bitter is the challenge that he flings
At bars and bolts and keys,
Torn with the cries of vanished centuries
And curses hurled at long-forgotten kings
Beyond dim seas.

The wind alone, of all the gods of old,
Men could not chain.
Oh, wild wind, brother to my wrath and pain,
Like you, within a restless heart I hold
A hurricane.

The wind has known the dungeons of the past,
Knows all that are;
And in due time will strew their dust afar
And singing, he will shout their doom at last
To a laughing star.

Oh, cleansing warrior wind, stronger than death,
Wiser than men may know;
Oh, smite these stubborn walls and lay them low,
Uproot and rend them with your mighty breath—
Blow, wild wind, blow!

Leavenworth Prison. —*Ralph Chaplin.*

We hate to expose our ignorance and simplicity, and yet we know of no other way to be honest with our readers. Just at present we cannot understand this Chinese question which has been for so long before the Disarmament Conference. We read and read —editorials, news despatches, special stories, speeches —but we just don't get anywhere! The situation, as we always see it, is that the great powers are *in* China, and they ought to get *out!* When a pack of thieves enter and occupy a house, the one thing to do, it seems to us, is to oust them. In this particular case, of course, the thieves are themselves the ones who are considering what to do. China (the householder) is making her plea to one burglar gathering up the rugs and pictures in the drawing-room, to another counting the spoons in the dining-room, to another packing the linen in the bed-rooms. But even so, the case is perfectly plain—these robbers *ought to get out!* Isn't that so? And if so, why all this talking, and conferring, and pronunciamentoing? We have to confess that it's all beyond us. "It is high, (we) cannot attain unto it." Or perhaps it is low, and we cannot descend to it! At any rate, we give it up, and confess that such mysteries are not for us!

President Wilson tells us that the League of Nations still lives! Undoubtedly! So did Daniel Webster when, aroused from slumber on his death-bed, he murmured those famous last words, "I still live." The signs of vitality in the League, however, as those in the immortal Daniel, are much more signs of approaching death than of returning life. The Supreme Council, for example, calls the proposed Genoa Conference, and specifically provides that the League of Nations shall be excluded! Poland and Lithuania flatly refuse to accept the League's award in the Vilna case—and what can be done about it? The League Court is announced to meet a few months hence—but where is there any indication that this institution will be accepted by the nations for adjudication of disputes that really involve the possibility of war? Is it not The Hague experience all over again? If anything is plain in this topsy-turvy world, it is that the center of interest has altogether shifted from the League of Nations to other and later experiments of international organization. The Treaty of Versailles and all its works, including the Covenant of the League, is everywhere (outside of France, at least!) admitted to be a failure; and the salvation of mankind, therefore, dependent upon its scrapping in favor of new endeavors after peace and order. As Washington and Genoa rise into the foreground, the League fades ever more dimly into the background. It was a brave and noble vision, vitiated in realization by the conspiracy of imperialistic interests which triumphed in the war. Wilson's glory consists in the fact that he tried, not that he succeeded; and why is this not glory enough?

Is justice bought and sold in this country like cheese? It is! Can the rich man do anything he wants with judges, courts, and the law generally? He can! Are lawyers, judges, executives personally corrupt? No, not as a rule; but they are so class-conscious that it is psychologically impossible for them to regard and treat the rich man and the poor man as equals before the bar! The Thaw case demonstrated these facts for all time. And now comes the Nobbe case today, like the Morse case yesterday, to add con-

firmation, as though confirmation were needed! Nobbe, the rich tile manufacturer, convicted with great difficulty and at vast expense of violations of the Sherman Anti-trust Law which involved as shameless a conspiracy against the public welfare for personal profit as not even the worst corruptions of the war period can show, is given the dreadful sentence of four months in jail. Before a month of this time has been served, Nobbe is secretly released by the President, on petition of the prosecuting attorney and the judge, on grounds of serious illness. When discovered in his home, he is described by his wife as still unwell, and hence unable to return to his business *"for two or three weeks"!!* Compare this story of amnesty, please, with the story, still unfinished, of amnesty for Debs and the political offenders! Or ask yourself this—If Nobbe had been a labor leader instead of a capitalist, what chance would he have had of securing pardon? If the rich man does wrong, he is seldom arrested; if arrested, he is seldom indicted; if indicted, he is seldom tried; if tried, he is seldom convicted; if convicted, he is seldom sent to prison; if sent to prison, he *never* stays there. If the poor man does wrong, *per contra,* he is promptly arrested, tried, convicted, and sentenced to the limit. And once in prison, he has about as much chance of getting out as a mouse caught in a trap! Justice?—there is no such thing! A man goes to prison only when he has no money to purchase release, and not otherwise!

The lectures given last August at Williamstown by the late James Bryce (we never could get into the habit of calling this distinguished gentleman and scholar "Viscount") constituted one of the most remarkable achievements of a life made notable by intellectual feats. It matched in his great old age the brilliant accomplishment of his youth in writing at twenty-four his standard history of "The Holy Roman Empire." In between these two extremes of the lengthy span of his career, in the full flower of his mature years, came his masterpiece, "The American Commonwealth." His notable ambassadorship in Washington, and his last great work, "Modern Democracies" (published in 1921), were the autumn fruitage of this mid-summer sowing. James Bryce was honored and beloved by the American people, first because he revealed them to themselves, with honest appreciation of faults and virtues; and secondly because he interpreted and vindicated that daring experiment of democracy to which they had committed the destinies of the Republic. Like many another venerable man before him, Bryce outlived his time; economic issues thrust into the background the political issues with which he dealt. During the war he lent his name to a report on German atrocities in Belgium which was an unworthy and is now a discredited piece of propaganda. But his best work is permanent; and his true spirit an enduring example of enlightened liberalism. America could not feel James Bryce's loss more keenly if he were her own!

The late Pope Benedict's accession to the papal throne followed by only a few weeks' time the outbreak of the Great War. This event gave to his Holiness at once such a problem and such an opportunity as had come to no head of the Roman church since the day that Leo I turned back Alaric and his hordes from the Eternal City. Benedict used this opportunity neither as gloriously as it might have been used, nor as basely as it actually was used by Protestant churchmen. We never tire of thinking of what the Pope might have done—nay, would have done!—had he been another Leo or Gregory! His denunciation of the war would have shaken the world—his excommunication of Catholic sovereigns and soldiers brought thunder-echoes from the Middle Ages—his command to Romanists everywhere not to take up arms, spread confusion in the ranks of mobilized armies in every country! Had Benedict had the courage and imagination to take this uncompromising stand against war, he would have restored at one stroke the ancient glory of the church, and perhaps brought peace. As it was, of course, he failed—but failed so nobly as compared with all the rest of Christendom, that he can be said to be the only churchman who saved Christianity from utter and complete disgrace. As the battle went on in 1914, his was the one voice lifted not in exultation but in lamentation. During all the conflict his prayers for peace were unceasing before the throne of God. Every power that he had as head of the universal church was exercised to the end of stopping the fray, and therewith saving men from death. So persistent was he in this worthy work of Christ, that he was feared and hated in all Allied countries as a pro-German. His letter to President Wilson marked the climax of his labors, as it did the finality of their failure. It may be fairly judged that Benedict was an impotent figure in this greatest of all wars, but if so, his weakness was political and personal, rather than spiritual. The church in our time had fallen to so low an estate that only a pope of transcendent power could have dominated the situation. Benedict was not such a man, he was a weak Pope of a weaker church. But what he could do, he did with courage, patience and unfaltering devotion to peace! That Christianity was not wholly disgraced by its chosen servants, is due to Pope Benedict more than to any other churchman of the period. Gone from a world that knows not peace, may he himself find peace!

It would be a cold heart which let the death of John Kendrick Bangs pass without a salutation and word of gratitude. Mr. Bangs' attitude and activity during

the war aggravated us beyond measure. His editorship of *Harper's Weekly* marked the beginning of the end of that great paper. But he wrote one book, "The House-Boat on the Styx," which should win absolution for almost any fault. We have not seen this work for many years; but we still remember the characters and incidents, and still smile the broadest kind of a grin at the memory of such colloquies as those, for example, between Noah and Barnum, and Shakespeare and Queen Elizabeth. Mr. Bangs was no such original genius as Artemus Ward, Mark Twain, or Finley Peter Dunne, but he was clever and intelligent, and in this one book, at least, achieved a masterpiece of humor.

Are We Solving the War Problem?

The near approach of the adjournment of the Washington Conference for the Limitation of Armaments makes more or less pertinent the inquiry as to whether we are getting anywhere in this matter of solving the problem of international war. Anticipating an unfavorable reply to this inquiry, the friends of the Conference would undoubtedly point out that it was not called for the purpose of dealing with the war problem at all, but only for the purpose of dealing with the problem of preparedness for war. But while this may be true from the technical point of view, it is also true, is it not, that we are interested in this Conference only as it affects the hope which we cherish, the necessity which we feel, of getting rid of war! Certainly it is from this standpoint that the Washington Conference is going to be judged by the historians of the future. Did this gathering of diplomats and statesmen take a few definite steps in the direction of abolishing war and thus establishing a durable peace upon the earth? Or did we have in this assembly only one more of those futile gestures with which we busy and amuse ourselves in the interim between the war that has gone and the war that has not yet come?

It goes without saying that nothing that was done before 1914 accomplished anything in the matter of solving the problem of war. It also goes without saying that, if we failed before the war to make any progress in the direction of peace, that failure has been continued in these years that have followed after. We had our first opportunity to do something at the Conference of Versailles, called expressly to write the settlement of a war that had been fought to end war. This Conference, however, did not so much end war as continue it. Since the adjournment of the Peace Conference, we have had numerous opportunities to improve the situation, to undertake deliberately and effectively the business of getting rid of war, but none of them has been utilized. Now we have the Conference at Washington! We should undoubtedly differ among ourselves as to what the Conference has accomplished, or has not accomplished. But let us take the most favorable possible view of the event! Let us agree, for the sake of argument, that the compact to scrap dreadnoughts, keep a ten-year naval holiday, and maintain naval armaments on a joint instead of a competitive basis of relationship, marks an epoch in human history. Let us concede that the four-power alliance in the Pacific immeasurably reduces the chances of war between Japan and the United States. Let us admit that the decision to restrict the use of submarines is worth at least the paper it is written on. Let us agree, I say, to all these things! But what progress has been made toward the abolition of war, which we all know to be the only real solution of the problem? A danger has been averted here, a situation has been improved over there; but the war system remains, does it not, and war therefore must be definitely taken into account in all of our ainticipations for the future? Is not Washington leaving us today just about where The Hague did years ago, when one member of that famous international congress said to another, "Henceforth, we are to fight all the same, but fight pacifically"?

It must be agreed that, up to the present time, our attempts to solve this problem of war have all of them been a humiliating and discouraging failure. We are no nearer the goal today than when Hugo Grotius laid down his principles of international law; not so near, perhaps, as when Virgil conceived his vision of the golden age. If we ask for the reason of this failure, would we not all of us reply that it is to be found in the fact that, from the beginning of time even until now, men have never sought out the origins of the phenomenon. They have been content to deal with symptoms, not with causes. In fighting the pestilential growth, they have plucked the leaves and pruned the branches, but have never laid the axe at the root of the tree. The causes of war are, in general, two in number! On the one hand, there are the psychological causes—those factors which lie in the inward experience of man, in the form of instincts, emotions and ideas, and which constitute the atmosphere in which he lives. Frederick Palmer, in his recent book, "The Folly of Nations," classifies these factors admirably as fear, love of adventure, thirst for power and glory, patriotism or love of one's own country, envy and rivalry or hate of some one else's country, the whole gamut of passions that are combative, revengeful or aggressive. Such psychological factors are vital; and until man has been educated to a new set of ideas, and diciplined to a new range of emotions, there would

seem to be little chance of solving this perplexing problem of war. On the other hand, there are the sociological causes that are involved—those factors which lie in the outward experience of man, in the form of political, economic, and social conditions, and which constitute the environment in which he lives. These include such phenomena as language, race, religion, social customs and habits, tribal migrations, dynasties, nations, and always the economic system in which men are grouped and by means of which they maintain their physical existence. It is my conviction that in our time it is our political system of nationalism, and, more fundamental still, our economic system of imperialism, which hold within themselves the secret of our problem. The tribal wars of ancient times, when vast hordes of men went marching on plains and mountains in quest of new lands to conquer, are gone forever. Religious wars are dead, and the wars of dynasties almost dead. What brings men into conflict today is an economic system in each one of the great countries of the world, which seeks to extend itself profitably to undeveloped portions of the globe, and there maintain closed ports and exclusive concessions under the militant protection of the national flag. It is the imperialism of Germany meeting the imperialism of England in Asia Minor and the Near East, or the imperialism of Japan meeting the imperialism of America in the Pacific and Far East, which tells the story of modern warfare. Now to attempt to get rid of war without getting rid of the fundamental causes of war, is exactly like trying to get rid of typhoid fever without getting rid of the polluted water or milk from which it springs. What we have here in this business of war is a scientific relation of cause and effect; and until the cause is removed, it is certain, is it not, that the effect is bound to come.

Such is the answer which most of us would give to the question as to why we have failed so egregiously in the past, and now at last in our own day, to solve the problem of war. The answer, to my mind, is absolutely sound, but it is also absolutely discouraging. For what chance is there of our being able to get rid of these basic causes of war, and thus get rid of war itself, before war, in its hideously destructive modern form, gets rid of us? Take the psychological causes of war—the ideas and emotions which lure men into conflict! It would be possible by a systematic course of education, to purge the souls of men of this corruption. We could change the human mind, give it a wholly new content and frontage, in the space of a single generation. Germany, under the lead of Bismarck, transformed an amiable and unaggressive people into one of the most militaristic nations of modern times, in the thirty years between 1860 and 1890. A public training, directed as intelligently and rigorously to the end of peace as Bismarck's method was directed to the end of war, would rear a race of men who would no more fight on the field of battle than they would offer human sacrifices on the altars of God. But with our schools and colleges, our newspapers, churches and public institutions generally, controlled and used as they are today, there is about as much chance of human nature being promptly changed in this direction as there is of the baser metals being transformed by chemical process into gold. So also with the social causes of war! The reconstruction of our political and economic system presents no theoretical difficulties. The program of the new order of society has been worked out to a remarkable degree of detail, and could be written in terms as definite as the clauses of the United States Constitution. But what chance is there of persuading the nations of the earth, or rather the governments which control and direct the foreign affairs of these nations, to make the sacrifice and sign the compacts which are necessary to rebuild the social order in the world at large? There was a time when I was optimistic about this business of political and economic reconstruction. I used to believe that "the parliament of man, the federation of the world," was just around the corner. But today I am not so confident. As I look about me and see what has happened, and what has not happened, since the war, I find myself forced to the conviction that things are in all probability going to go on in the future very much as they have gone on in the past. I see little prospect, in other words, of any fundamental social changes in the lifetime of any who are now living. And yet the very continuance of the existing system of international relations is breeding "the next war" which is to annihilate us all! All of which means, does it not, that if we can do nothing more immediate and direct to solve the problem of war than eradicate its causes, there is little chance of our succeeding in our task. We are certain to be devoured before we reach our goal. Our method is absolutely scientific. We are unquestionably on the right track. But if there is nothing else that we can do, nothing that we can interpose to stay the flood of disaster while our work is going on, it is certain that we shall labor in vain.

It is this necessity of doing something effective without delay, and thus gaining time, as it were, for these fundamental changes of which I speak, which lends enormous interest to a program for the abolition of war which has just been published by an important group of lawyers, educators, social workers and publicists in the city of Chicago.* In many ways this plan is the most interesting and promising that I have ever seen. It is so simple, so obvious an extension of man's unvarying practice of dealing with the social evils that have threatened his existence in the past, that one wonders that it has never been systematically worked out before. I propose to submit it herewith, not with

*See article, "Outlawry of War," by Salmon O. Levinson, in UNITY (December 29, 1921).

the idea of presenting a panacea which will cure us all tomorrow, but rather with the idea of showing something effective that may be done today while we toil at this fundamental job of producing ideal men in an ideal world.

In presenting this program, it is necessary to call attention to certain preliminary considerations which we must keep clearly in mind as a condition of understanding what is proposed.

In the first place, it is important to notice that the program concerns itself exclusively with international wars. It does not pretend to touch the question of wars inside of nations, which are known as revolutions or rebellions. Its advocates point out that when we speak of the war problem, we have specifically in mind the problem of wars between the nations of the earth. It is these wars which are threatening to destroy civilization, after the fashion of the Great War of 1914.

In the second place, I would point out the interesting and significant fact that war, internationally speaking, is a recognized and established institution among us, like marriage, or religion, or the state. It has its laws and customs, its prohibitions and sanctions; it is our way of doing things in one particular field of social life. Now that war should hold this position of recognition and sanction in the days when it was regarded as glorious to fight, and every gentleman was expected to be a soldier, is not difficult to understand. But war today is regarded as hideous and evil, in our saner moments we denounce it unhesitatingly as immoral. And yet today, exactly as yesterday, we have done nothing to make it wrong for one nation to go to war against another. This was illustrated with extraordinary impressiveness at the outbreak of the Great War. When Germany declared hostilities, she did two things. She threw her armies against Russia in the east, and then against Belgium in the west. Now if we can get our minds back to those early days of the struggle, we will remember that, apart from the general horror at the fact of war itself, nobody blamed Germany for invading Russia. In doing this, she was acting entirely within her rights. The great tide of moral indignation which rolled up so suddenly against the Kaiser, was directed exclusively against the invasion of Belgium. This was wrong!—but wrong not because it was an invasion by force of arms, but because it was an invasion in violation of a treaty. The Kaiser's fault was not what he did, but the way he did it. He had a right to play the game, but no right to break the rules of the game. For war has its rules, like any other custom of the times! All of which means that we not only do nothing to make war wrong, but do a great deal to make it right. We accept it so unquestionably, in other words, that we actually go out of our way to adopt a code of law for the government of war. Every peace conference of modern times, including the one now meeting in Washington, has in reality been a conference for the laying down of rules and regulations for the proper conduct of war between nations. We take pains to specify that certain things shall not be done, certain weapons shall not be used! But of course this means that certain other things may be done, certain other weapons may be used! War, in other words, is right. In the very process of defining what is legal in war, we declare that war itself is legal! By legislating as to the conditions under which it shall be fought, we raise it to the dignity of a recognized and reputable method of civilized procedure. We sanction it, as we sanction marriage; we bless it as we bless the home; we protect it as we used to protect the liquor traffic and chattel slavery. We make war, in other words, an institution. Destructive and evil as it is, we still regard it as legal and therefore right. The only wars, strangely enough, which we denounce as illegal and wrong, are those very wars which everybody but the non-resistant would regard as beneficent. I refer to those wars inside the nations which mean resistance against oppression. A man who takes up arms against his government on behalf of liberty and justice, is an outlaw and a traitor; and, if seized, he is put to death for his crime. But a Kaiser who takes up arms against the world is a warrior acting under his rights, and, when beaten, is left to lead the life of a country gentleman in dignity and ease!

This brings me to a third point which I would call to your attention. In the case of every other institutionalized evil of this kind, society has worked out a definite method of procedure for its removal. Men have known, of course, that no evil is really conquered and eradicated until its causes are removed, but they have not waited for this fundamental work to be done before taking action. On the contrary, just as soon as the moral judgment of men has been registered against an institution, they have proceeded to outlaw it from society. They have transformed a moral judgment into a legal code, translated conscience into law, and thereby mobilized public sentiment in support of the affirmation that what is wrong shall also be declared to be illegal. This was what happened in the case of slavery. Society did not wait to deal with the causes of this institution before taking up the fight against it. When men became convinced that slavery was wrong, they banished it from the land by a constitutional amendment, and thereby cleared the ground for combating the forces which make one man socially inferior to another. So also with prostitution! The roots of this abomination run far down into the soil of human nature, and also into the soil of social and economic conditions. These roots are deeply imbedded, and the institution still flourishes among us. But we are not saying that nothing shall be done, or can be done, until these causes are removed. On the contrary, we accept the slogan of the Chicago Vice Commission, given to the world in 1911—"Constant and persistent

repression of prostitution, the immediate method; absolute annihilation, the ultimate ideal"—and we write the laws and organize the courts to accomplish this great aim. The best illustration, from our viewpoint, however, is duelling. How long would it have taken us to remove this institution of private war, if we had said there was nothing to do against it but try and remove the causes? These causes, in many ways, are just as fully operative among us today as they were yesterday; they show themselves in sporadic outbreaks of fighting between private individuals. But the institution is gone, and most of the fighting is over, because in 1850 the duel was declared to be a crime and the duellist a criminal, and society organized accordingly. Of course, in all these cases, the outlawry of the institution was not attempted until society was ready for it. The hazard of anticipating moral judgment by legal enactment is being clearly shown today in certain phases of our "prohibition" situation. But if conscience has spoken, the next step is the law of banishment. And who shall dare to say that the conscience of the race is not speaking at this hour against war?

But, if this be true, why is the decree of banishment not spoken? If war lingers among us, as a legal and honorable institution, must it not be for some good and sufficient reason? This brings me to the fourth point to which I would call attention. I refer to the fact that war, for all its evil, performs a certain very definite social function. It does something which has to be done, and which at the present moment, unfortunately, is done in no other way. Technically speaking, war must be described as the final method of settling disputes between nations. When every other method has failed—diplomacy, conciliation, arbitration —we proceed to fight. What is there left to appeal to but force, and a settlement on the basis of the stronger in a test of arms? War, in other words, is literally a court of last resort. It is the supreme court of the nations for the final settlement of all the disputes and rivalries that arise between them. In this sense, it is an exact equivalent, internationally, of the old "ordeal by battle" among the Teutons. When their tribesmen could not adjust their differences, it was agreed that they should "fight it out," under conditions imposed by the laws of the tribe. The "ordeal," in other words, was a legal institution provided and maintained for the purpose of settling disputes between individuals. In the same way, war today is a legal institution established and maintained for the purpose of settling disputes between nations. It is an expensive institution, a cruel institution, an immoral institution, and institution so bad that some of us refuse to use it; but it does something which is done in no other way, and until some new social mechanism is established to do what war now does, we can be perfectly sure that, for all of its horrors, it will continue.

This brings me to the last point which I would emphasize before coming to the statement of the program. I refer to the fact that institutions survive among us, long after their usefulness is finished, long after the remedy they offer is worse than the disease, for the simple reason that nothing is provided to take their place. It is not enough, in other words, arbitrarily to abolish an institution, to prohibit a practice which has become a danger to society. The very fact that this institution or practice exists at all, proves that it is performing, however atrociously, some kind of social function. This being the case, we must not only outlaw what we want to get rid of, but provide for it some alternative. We must create a piece of social mechanism which performs the particular social function involved so much better than the old mechanism, that competition is impossible. It is this provision of an adequate substitute, in the last analysis, which determines the success or failure of a policy of abolition by law. The duel provides as excellent illustration. If society had simply prohibited the duel, and let it go at that, it would have been a superb but ineffective gesture. As it was, however, society did not outlaw the duel until after it had established courts of law for the redress of individual grievances. For a considerable time the two institutions existed side by side. Men resorted to the duel because they claimed that justice was slow and uncertain, and that the manhood of the individual required satisfaction on the "field of honor." But the struggle was unequal, the courts proved their worth. When at last the duel was banished as a crime, society merely registered a decision which had already been made by common sense as well as conscience. To establish something that is better, to prove that an evil is not only wicked but stupid, this is the one way to make final the outlawry of the evil!

With these rather haphazard but in each case very important considerations in mind, we are now ready to consider this program for the handling of our war problem, which has recently been presented by our friends in Chicago. I can describe it briefly, because it is simple in the extreme.

It begins with the proposal that all the nations of the earth shall be called together into conference for the purpose of creating and codifying a code of international law. This is something new in the history of mankind. At the present time we have no international law, save a few agreements and precedents which may be violated with impunity at any time. This proposes that the world shall be given a body of statute law, or even a constitution, by which conduct may be guided, standards established, and order maintained.

Secondly, this program provides that the further use of war as an institution for the settlement of disputes between nations, shall be formally abolished. War, in other words, shall no longer be legally recognized, as

it is at present. On the contrary, it shall be declared to be a crime, punishable by the law of nations.

Thirdly, an international court shall be established for the interpretation of the code of law, and the settlement by legal process of all purely international disputes. This court shall have original jurisdiction, after the model of the United States Supreme Court in controversies between states.

Lastly, the court shall be sustained and its decisions enforced not by force of arms but by the normal and potent sanction of public opinion. The idea of force, in other words, shall be abandoned, even to the extent of an international police force, and reliance be placed upon moral power.

In noting the points of this program, we are first of all reminded, I suppose, of Hague Conferences and other international organizations of the past. If so, however, it must be only to discover the vast differences which separate this program from all others which have preceded it. Thus the Hague Conferences never provided for any creation and codification of international law, but left things just where they were before—in a state of chaos. They attempted to control international relationships without any basic law upon which to act, and of course they failed. Again, the Hague Conferences never outlawed war, but on the contrary strengthened and sanctioned its legality by providing for specific occasions and conditions under which it should be waged. Still again, these previous attempts at international organization never at any time placed reliance in moral sanction, but always accepted force as the last resort of peace. "We will have peace," they said, "even if we have to fight for it." The irony of such agreement is obvious, and its failure certain. Lastly, the Hague Conferences never established a real court for the settlement of international disputes. They talked a good deal about courts, but they never went beyond the idea of arbitration, which is a very different thing from the judicial process. Thus they left the nations free to come before the court or not, as they saw fit. They recognized the distinction between "justiciable" and "non-justiciable" disputes, and thus ruled out from consideration all questions which had any likelihood of causing war. This Chicago program, however, establishes a court that *is* a court. It gives it original power of jurisdiction. It provides that any nation may summon another nation before the bar, and the case be heard and settled whether the second nation appears or not. It declares that all questions of an international nature, even those delicate questions of national honor, are proper business for the court. For the first time in history, we have a definite proposal that the arbitrament of arms shall yield absolutely to the arbitrament of reason.

Such is the plan! Now what are we to say about it? For my own part, may I say, that this proposal seems to me to be so superior to any other program of international organization that I have ever seen, that I regard it as standing in a class by itself. It impresses me as statesmanship of the highest order. I like it because it keeps to the line of evolution. It recognizes that the progress of civilization has been marked by the step-by-step substitution of methods of law and reason for methods of violence and force. In all human relations, from individuals and groups to separate states within the nations, the processes of court procedure have been steadily adopted, and reason thus enthroned as the arbiter of human affairs. Only in the international field is this system lacking, and our program proposes that this one last step of evolution shall now be taken.

I like the plan, again, because it definitely abandons the idea of force, and commits itself to moral sanctions. Every previous international scheme that I know anything about, has been utterly vitiated by the fact that, sooner or later, it recognized that very element of force which it was trying to get rid of. In seeking to abolish war, in other words, it re-established it, and thus accomplished nothing. The League to *Enforce* Peace is an exact illustration of what I mean. The Chicago program breaks with this tradition, and builds a system which has the "new foundation" of reason and the moral law.

Again, I like this plan because it places war where it belongs—on the same level with piracy and assassination. It defines war for what it is—murder by wholesale, and therefore a crime against humanity. It makes the soldier a felon, the military uniform a convict's garb, the men who declare war outlaws from the society of mankind.

Lastly, I like this plan because, for the first time in human experience, it mobilizes the moral sentiment of the race against war and on the side of peace. Men act at bottom on their emotions and not upon the dictates of their reason. At present, as always in the past, men's emotions are linked up with the interests of war and not of peace. The moment that war becomes a possibility, the whole tidal flow of the human spirit moves in the direction of hostilities, and a man has to become a criminal or a martyr to resist it. Under this plan, however, the tidal flow would move in the opposite direction. Our emotions would be mobilized for peace and not for war. The pacifist would be the patriot, and the militarist the outcast among men.

On the other hand, however, there are objections to the program, and these naturally cluster about the questions as to whether it can be made to work. Take, for example, the matter of abolishing war! Is not our position here like that of Hotspur in Henry IV who said, "I also can call the spirits from the vasty deep, *but will they come?*" We can wave war away, but will it stay away? This is a real difficulty; and it

can be answered only by pointing out that, in this matter of outlawing war, the Chicago program is relying upon no magic word or futile gesture. It is attempting the great task of mobilizing moral sentiment for the achievement of a moral end. It is enlisting on behalf of peace, in other words, the organized conscience of mankind, by declaring war to be disreputable. And experience shows that when the law of disrepute or dishonor is thus appealed to, it becomes the mightiest force in all the world. Men laughed when duelling was abolished, and said it could not be done; but it *was* done, with a speed that took men's breath away.

Again, there may be serious questions about the international court. It is easy enough to set up a court, but how are we going to enforce its decisions? Suppose China brings Japan into the court and gets a decision against Japan on the Shantung issue. Do we imagine that Japan would obey the decree of the court, unless forced to do so? Would we not have to rely on force in the last analysis? To which we answer that if force is recognized at all, the whole plan is sure to fail! This question was debated when our Constitution was written, and it was proposed to give the Supreme Court power to enforce its decisions in disputes between States. James Madison argued that to do so would create anarchy and rebellion, and thus disrupt the union at the start. As a result of this plea, we have the interesting fact, not known to most people, that the Supreme Court of the United States possesses no power of any kind to enforce its decisions against the states. It has no police; it cannot call upon the army. And yet, during all the years of its existence, it has never had a decision disregarded or denied! The explanation is easy. The abandonment of force mobilizes behind the Court the moral sentiment of men. It makes obedience a matter not of submission but of honor, and men respond. What has worked, now, in this vast country, a continent in itself, may well work in the world at large. The situation is more difficult, but not impossible.

Lastly, there is the latent feeling in us all, I suppose, that this scheme, like every other scheme of its kind, is futile so long as the causes that make for war remain untamed. To this may I make just one suggestion. When we speak of the causes of war, do we really mean the causes of *war,* or the causes of the *disputes* that are settled by war? The inward passions and outward rivalries of men lead to disputes, and war comes only when these disputes have to be settled. Lacking any other method of settlement, as we have shown, the resort is made to arms. Now the causes of disputes are going to be with us for an indefinite period. Which means that the salvation of the race depends upon finding some way of getting disputes settled without war. And here is the best proposal I have seen! Our situation is that of the inhabitants of a flood-stricken area of country. Constantly the waters from the mountains accumulate; regularly there come the intervals when the water has to run off; and down sweeps the flood, with all its tide of destruction and death! Nothing can be done, say the people, until the rain stops falling or the water stops accumulating. But along one day there comes a practical man who says, "You're wrong! I do not know whether the waters can be stopped or not, but I do know that the floods can. What you need to do is to build channels to carry off the waters when the breaking-point comes."

It is this sort of an idea which sums up the whole situation before us. There are forces present in the world which we know may break loose at any moment. We cannot hope to check these forces in time to save civilization from eventual destruction. But we can control them in their operation; we can guide them, if we will, from the flood-areas of force to the safe channels of reason and goodwill. It is this, and not the abolition of causes, which constitutes our war problem at this moment. Hence the ceaseless endeavors of men to fashion some system of international order which shall hold our world together until the fundamental things are done! To this endeavor, and its imperative character, no man has given better expression in our time than Mr. H. G. Wells. In his "Outline of History," and again in his letters on the Washington Conference, he has laid down the fundamental proposition that we must provide "a world law under a world government—in no other fashion is a secure world peace conceivable." "In what manner," he asks, in the "Outline," "may we expect things to move towards this end?" I am not wise enough to say. But the best program I have seen is this which establishes law, provides for justice, and outlaws war from the social ways of men.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

BEAUTY LIKE DAWN SHED OVER ME.

The mountain crest against the sky.
(O transient little atom I . . .)

The clouds majestic as they pass.
(And I am but the swaying grass. . .)

The wind in lofty music sings.
(And I am but of earthly things. . .)

In New York Sun.

The giant pines aloft on high
Seem mingling with the misty sky—

The sun is like a golden frieze—
Thank God for beauty such as these—

Beauty like dawn shed over me—
Symbol of my immorality!

—Blanche Shoemaker Wagstaff.

John Burroughs' Nature God

In the early days of American history it was possible for a person to venture into, with a reasonable degree of success, a number of vocations. Benjamin Franklin was not only a man of letters, but a printer and a politician. Even in our own specialized generation we have, as lingering vestiges, these polyprofessionalists—politicians, for example, who lecture on religion and science; and business men who dabble in philosophy. So it was with John Burroughs.

Primarily a man of birds, an appraiser of sunset beauties; primarily an appreciator of nature's æsthetic values; and yet, in addition, a philosopher. I make clear this twofold interest of our Riverby dreamer, not for the purpose of criticism—one could hardly study nature's mysteries without philosophizing on man's destiny—but rather that we may keep clearly in mind, while discussing Mr. Burroughs' concept of a nature God, the fact that the whole field of philosophy was, for our self-schooled naturalist, an avocation. Academically and professionally speaking, Mr. Burroughs was only an amateur philosopher. His district school education confined itself largely to the three "R's"; while the logic course taken during his few months of training at Ashland Institute was very elementary. The only reason that Mr. Burroughs chose this course was because he had never heard of logic before. Lack of detail, however, often affords scope for vision.

Pedantic psychologists were amazed at Watson's behavioristic method. Why? Not because objective psychology was a new discovery; but because Watson, a mere amateur in the field, should so keenly see and apply its possibilities. Why had not orthodox psychologists grasped the significance of this method? Because technique often blinds the vision. The freedom from technicalities and precedent which the amateur, through his ignorance gains, has often proved of inestimable worth. Is it possible that our dilettant philosopher, Burroughs, has, because of such freedom, discovered in nature a god overlooked by our learned theologians? Is there something prophetic in that sentence contained in the preface of his book, "Accepting the Universe," which reads: "I feel that each of these chapters might be called an altar to the Unknown God"? Let us investigate.

"The beauty of natural religion," wrote our bard of Slabsides, "is that you have it all the time; you do not have to seek it afar off in myths and legends, in catacombs, in garbled texts, in miracles of dead saints or winebibbing friars. It is of today; it is now and here; it is everywhere. The crickets chirp it, the birds sing it, the breezes chant it, the thunder proclaims it, the streams murmur it, the unaffected man lives it. Its incense rises from the plowed fields, it is on the morning breeze, it is in the forest breath and in the spray of the wave. The frosts write it in exquisite characters, the dews impearl it, and the rainbow paints in on the cloud. It is not an insurance policy underwritten by a bishop or a priest; it is not even a faith; it is a love, an enthusiasm, a consecration to natural truth."

If Mr. Wells ever compiles for us a new Bible, I sincerely hope that he will find a place, between its covers, for the paragraph which I have just quoted from Burroughs' essay on the "Faith of the Naturalist." Its words throb with religious emotion. No Hebrew prophet ever approached Jehovah with words more pregnant with the pulsations of devotion than did Mr. Burroughs, in this paragraph, approach the object of his religious affection—nature.

Can one make nature their God, and by so doing build up a religious system? Have we a right to look upon devotion to nature as a religion? Prof. J. R. Seeley said that any "habitual and regulated admiration is worthy to be called a religion." Mr. Burroughs' own definition of religion—"a spiritual flowering"—although coached in botanic terms is very suggestive. So many are the definitions of religion that it is unwise to be dogmatic when trying to define a term which is so elusive. Preferring to err on the charge of being too liberal rather than too restricted, let us define religion as a poetic, friendly attitude toward those environing cosmic forces which seem to determine human destiny. Accepting this as a definition, we can easily see that it would be possible to posit nature as a God, and then build up a religious system around that postulate. This is exactly what Mr. Burroughs did, although he did not work out his religion into anything approaching a highly organized system. Its simplicity was in harmony with the modest and rustic appointments of Slabsides, which was,

> . . . furnished in itself
> With the few needful things that life requires;
> In rugged arms how soft it seems to lie,
> How tenderly protected!

What need had one in such a habitat for a complex ethical religion? Nature was his companion by day, while in the evening before the open fire, Silly Sally, the cat, shared patiently his thoughts. As ornithologists the two had much in common, for of Silly Sally, Mr. Burroughs, in his dry humor, said:

She must engage in all the feather splittings that the ornithologists do, and she isn't satisfied until she has thoroughly dissected and digested her material, and has all the dry bones of the subject laid bare.

It was not a religion that Jesus gave us—merely the concept of a loving, father God; yet from that concept has emerged Christianity. It is not a religion that Mr. Burroughs has left us—merely the concept of a nature God; yet who dare prophesy the potentialities that lie dormant in that concept!

"The nature gods we know," wrote our pantheistic naturalist, "we live in daily and hourly converse with them; we see and know that we are dependent upon them every moment of our lives. These gods—air, water, fire, earth—and the greater gods whose eyes blink to us in the midnight skies, why not credit them with the gifts that we ascribe to the imaginary gods of the supernatural?"

As Goethe could not believe that the cork trees grow merely that we may stop our bottles, so Mr. Burroughs could not believe that this world was made any more for man than it was made for mice and midges. He believed that life "in all its forms is for its own sake"; that this world is merely a link in a chain of cosmic events, and that it was created no more for man than for any other creature. We do not wonder, therefore, that Mr. Burroughs criticized with vehemence, all egotistical conceptions regarding man's station on this earth. Why should man think that he is favored above all other organic life? Flowers do not bloom in order to minister to his æsthetic taste; nor do stars revolve in their orbits in order to stimulate his admiration and awe. We are a part of the cosmos, and a very infinitesimal part at that. Nothing exists for us alone, in fact we ourselves only exist because we have been able to adapt ourselves to existing conditions.

"Why should we put on superior airs when not one atom of matter will turn aside for us," asked our naturalist, then hastened to add: "We were cradled in the old seas; we are kin to

the worm and the mollusk; we derive from creeping, swimming, noisome things, from the slime and mud of the old sea bottoms, from the cosmic dust and the solar radiations."

One can all but see the smile play over that placid yet hardy face, as our nature lover, turning to the question of good and evil, ironically said:

Surely it was a good devil that put man in the way of knowing good from evil, and led to his expulsion from a state of innocent impotence.

Good and evil are merely man made conceptions. Nature knows no such division, except as she has created it in man. "To gain heaven and avoid hell," wrote our Riverby dreamer, "are devices of cunning Nature to spur us on the road of development." At another time he wrote:

Heaven and hell are both dreams of our mixed and struggling lives, the one the outcome of our aspirations for the good, the other the outcome of our fear of evil.

It is quite as childish for us to "postulate the existence of life," and by so doing to conceive of good and evil, as it is for us to anthropomorphize our God, and by so doing ascribe to him all human attributes. "There is no such thing as *absolute* evil or absolute good." Evil was for Mr. Burroughs, merely a convenient term for designating those things which are against our well-being; while good was a similar term used to designate those things which promote our interests. Nature is neither moral nor immoral—it is unmoral. The cruelty seemingly witnessed in the animal world is only an illusion on our part, for man is the only creature that tortures another creature for the purpose of inflicting pain. Carnivorous habits do not imply cruelty. "Tooth and claw usually overwhelm by a sudden blow, and sudden blows benumb and paralyze." Nature thus has her own anæsthetic. With this sweeping blow, Mr. Burroughs dismissed the notion of evil. God and nature are one, and in her there is no evil.

"The vices and crimes and follies and excesses of society are the riot and overflow of the virtues," for, continued our naturalist, "there can be no perversions till there is something good to pervert, no counterfeits till there is first the genuine article."

In reviewing briefly Mr. Burroughs' conceptions regarding the soul and immortality, it is fitting that we give as a prologue the following lines from John Russell McCarthy:

> Hereafter, not by one and one,—your soul
> Alone among the souls of other men,
> Drifting and staying, a thing apart forever—
> But we must see when all at last is counted
> And the great sum is made, how one by one
> We have returned to Her, the Mother of All,—
> The bit of soul-stuff that She loaned us.

Man is like the tree, the dog. With death life ceases, the same as the flame ceases to exist when the candle is blown out. The minute we postulate a soul in man, and deny such to trees and dogs, we encounter grave biological difficulties. The characteristic which differentiates man from the lower animal world is not the possession of an independent entity, known as the soul, but rather greater brain power.

To some this seems a harsh, cruel philosophy of life, and they wonder how the gentle John of Birds could have found pleasure in roaming through the woods, believing, as he did, that "the fortunes of the individual trees are much like those of men and women in a human community—struggle, competition, defeat, decay, and death on all sides."

Briefly and negatively stated, Mr. Burroughs' theological beliefs were as follows: God and nature are one and inseparable. Evil and good are man invented concepts, for nature, apart from man, is unmoral. The soul and body are one, and as inseparable as is God from nature. There is no immortality, for death is but the returning to nature of "the bit of soul-stuff that She loaned us."

Let us not, however, be too hasty in our judgment. There is another side—the positive. Feel the religious emotion which permeates these words:

. . . a nature God in whom we really live and move and have our being, with whom our relation is as intimate and constant as that of the babe in its mother's womb, or the apple upon the bough. This is the God that science and reason reveal to us—the God we touch with our hands, see with our eyes, hear with our ears, and from whom there is no escape—a God whom we serve and please by works, not by words, whose worship is deeds, and whose justification is in adjusting ourselves to his laws and availing ourselves of his bounty, a God who is indeed from everlasting to everlasting.

God is nature, and nature is God. This is no new doctrine. Pantheism dates back to the Greek philosopher, Thales of Miletus (640 B. C.); yet coming fresh to us from Riverby, it carries with it the savor of that which is new. Mr. Burroughs has not proclaimed to us, like Paul to the Athenians, an unknown God; but he has set up for us the tumbled down altars of a forgotten God.

Primarily a man of birds, an appraiser of sunset beauties; primarily an appreciator of nature's æsthetic values; and yet, because philosophy was for him merely an avocation, our Riverby dreamer was free to focus the broader vision—God is nature; the universe, in all its totality, is Divinity. While scholastic theologians with their miscroscopes of eccleciastical dogma were minutely analyzing cosmic forces and moral values, in their effort to discover a life source which they could call God, our amateur philosopher swept the cosmos with his telescope, and said: "I'll take it all for my God."

God may be a force, God may be a personality, God may be a moral value; or, what is more probable, God may be all three, and more. Whatever he is, he cannot be less than a part of all that is; hence Mr. Burroughs, in accepting all, accepted God.

EDWARD ARTHUR ROCKWOOD.
University of Chicago.

TO JOHN BURROUGHS.

We waste our days with creeds and empty words,
  Pretending God will give attention due.
  Alas, He does not hear! He turned to you,
Who knew and loved His roses and His birds!
You had no time for proudly pious vows,
  So humbled were you by the dawn's surprise.
  You searched no book for miracles: your eyes
Found wonders strange among the blossomed boughs.
Bequeath to us your wisdom, prophet sage,
  That we at last may learn the way of life,
  That we may not be stifled by the strife
Of brutal men, in this inglorious age.
Although your feet now tread immortal ways,
Your spirit still shall light our clouded days.

THOMAS CURTIS CLARK.

The World's Great Rebels and Heretics

No. V.

SPARTACUS, THE GLADIATOR STRIKE-LEADER.

The lot of the slave-laborer in imperial Rome was intolerable. Osborne Ward rescues for us the names of six of the major leaders, who led the great strike-revolts of the "hewers of wood and drawers of water." *Drimakos* on the Isle of Scio, ran away from slavery, gathered about him other brave spirits, and they formed a rebellious band of mountaineers that for ten years plagued their masters.

Ennus in Sicily, led from 143 B. C. to 130, a successful labor revolt. A wretched slave asking his master for more clothing to cover his chilled body was tied to the post and whipped, and sent back naked to his labor. Upon this incident the bold rebel appealed for followers, and before he was through 200,000 slaves were at his back, and they defeated army after army sent against them from Rome.

Athenion was another brave spirit in Sicily, who, a few years later than Ennus, led a labor revolt. *Viriathus* in Spain and *Aristonicus* in Asia Minor were other brave strike-leaders who gave their lives in leading the slave-laborers to revolt.

The most romantic, and in many ways the most influential and successful of the labor uprisings in the Roman empire, was that led by *Spartacus,* the Gladiator, about 70 B. C.

In 73 B. C., Spartacus, who had been the victor in innumerable contests in the gladiatorial shows, led a revolt, and with some 200 other gladiators escaped. In the battle with soldiers 125 were slain, but with 75 men Spartacus reached the mountains, where with the aid of herdsmen and other escaped slaves, he overpowered 3,000 Roman soldiers and secured their arms.

The praetor Publius Varinius now took the field against Spartacus. Tradition says that the reason Spartacus was sold into slavery, was, that he was a deserting soldier. Whether this be true or not, he showed great military shrewdness and out-maneuvered and defeated the praetor.

Desperate men and slaves joined the resourceful leaders, and soon the whole of southern Italy was in his possession. The Senate sent both consuls against him, and both were defeated, and Spartacus with a victorious army pressed on toward the Alps. Here was the chance for his army. Once beyond the Alps they could have defied any army Rome would have sent against them, but the army refused to leave Italy. The armies of Caius Cassius and the praetor Manlius were defeated in turn, but Rome could replenish her armies, Spartacus could not; added to this came the bribery of his transports and the jealousies of ignorant officers, and his army was defeated and he was killed.

Not till Robert E. Lee did the world see a military leader so skillful in maneuvering an army inferior in numbers and destined to defeat, as we see in the military genius of Spartacus.

ROLAND D. SAWYER.

THE WAYS OF TRUTH.

Who loves not Beauty can, forsooth,
Know little of the ways of Truth;
For never yet was Truth made clear
That did not beautiful appear.

VICTOR E. SOUTHWORTH.

THE STUDY TABLE

In the Psychic Field

Baudouin's "Suggestion and Autosuggestion"[1] is an unusually satisfactory piece of work in a field where there has been too much juggling of words and too much mysticism. It is "a psychological and pedagogical study based upon investigations made by the New Nancy School." It traces the history of suggestion as used in the treatment of disease and aims to show the basis of that use and applications that can be made of suggestion outside of the treatment of sick persons —in the direction of the education of children and the formation of conduct. Above all it attempts to show that suggestion—instead of being unusual, exceptional and a resort in crises—is constantly at work in every affair of life. Suggestion is defined as the subconscious realization of an idea. It is classified under three forms:

1. spontaneous suggestion } = autosuggestion
2. reflective suggestion }
3. induced suggestion = heterosuggestion

For most persons it is the third of these, hypnotism of a subject by an operator, which is usually meant by the word. It is, however, the least common, the exceptional, the least important of the three. A special division of the book is devoted to each of the three forms. The discussion is most thorough, and surely most interesting, in regard to spontaneous suggestion, the importance and universality of which is emphasized through ample demonstration and illustration. In connection with it the laws of suggestion are formulated. Four laws are stated: the law of concentrated attention, the law of auxiliary emotion, the law of reversed effort, the law of subconscious teleology. The author recognizes the importance of what psychoanalysis has gained, but psychoanalysis is not his theme. If the full significance of suggestion were recognized, if people were developed in the direction of reflective suggestion, there would be little necessity for heterosuggestion or for the practice of psychoanalysis. The main purpose of the book is practical. It urges study of one's self and a purposed development and training of suggestion in one's own case. It urges intentional, professional, use of suggestion in education. The work of the teacher is largely through suggestion. The power of preacher, leader, successful business, lies in suggestion. Up to the present suggestion has been used unintelligently and at haphazard. Few teachers or leaders have recognized its significance or grasped its laws. Baudouin lays down specific directions for developing and using suggestion. He urges everyone to this development for their own advantage and the benefit of the community.

Among the many books—good, bad and indifferent —due to the present interest in psychoanalysis, few are more valuable than Lay's "Man's Unconscious Spirit."[2] It is an approach to an old subject from a new point of view. Lay's purpose is to find the meaning of spiritualism and he studies it by psychoanalysis. To anyone who is seriously interested in either spiritualism or psychoanalysis, the book will well repay a

[1] "Suggestion and Autosuggestion." Charles Baudouin. New York: 1921. Dodd, Mead and Co. 16mo., pp. 349.
[2] "Man's Unconscious Spirit." Wilfred Lay. New York: 1921. Dodd, Mead and Co. 16mo., pp. 337.

thoughtful reading and re-reading. It is well written and, though dealing with material especially difficult for clear and intelligible presentation, has both interest and style. More than that, the author seems to well establish his contention, which is that spirits are the projection of that which lies in the unconscious of the medium; that this projection takes place in accordance with the unconscious wishes of the medium and the consultant. To the elucidation and establishment of this claim, the author devotes a well-developed and carefully thought argument. His treatment is under three divisions. The first is a remarkable analysis of consciousness; the second is the unconscious of psychoanalysis; the third is the unconscious spirit. The kernel of the book is of course in this last part. The most important thing that can take place in the scientific study of spiritualism is the psychoanalysis of the medium. Such analysis is little likely to occur as the medium objects. "If the medium were analyzed he would then have it made clear to him that all the trance utterances are but emanations from his own mind. The fashion is for the medium to repudiate this idea, because at present the fashion is to pay big rewards or homage to the mediums." Many of the books that have been written on psychoanalysis have been of a nature to work harm; they ought not to be read by the general public. Lay's book is an exception. No one who is seeking the bizarre and sensational will find that it holds his attention. No thoughtful reader can gain aught but personal advantage and profit from our author's masterly discussion of consciousness.

We confess to a keen sense of disappointment in the book by Lawrence upon "Spiritualism Among Civilized and Savage Races."[3] It is interesting and lively reading, fitted to while away a leisure hour. But the title-page tells us that the book is a study in anthropology, the author is stated to be F. R. A. I. (Fellow of the Royal Anthropological Institute), and in the preface obligation is acknowledged to the President of the Anthropological Institute and to the British Museum. Under these circumstances we are warranted in expecting a serious, well organized study of a really important subject. What we really find is a mass of scattered facts and observations drawn from various parts of the world, put into the form of a scrappy statement, together with some expressions and statements regarding spiritualism from English believers. The science flag is waved constantly, but there is no science in the arrangement or argument of the book. More than that, Mr. Lawrence—though a F. R. A. I. and a member of the Geologists' Association—is religiously safely orthodox and his assault against spiritualism, chiefly along lines of ridicule, is launched as much from the religious as from the scientific camp. This scientific-religious combination will no doubt be frequent as time goes on. It is part of the same superstitious sweep as the present recrudescence of spiritualism itself. It is none the less incongruous. The author's closing paragraph may be quoted as a fair example of his attitude and method.

> Thus we find that the reversions to the past, which the ignorant proclaim as new gospels, are nevertheless dangerous maladies needing the scalpel of the specialist before they poison the mob. Modern spiritualism is a reversion of a dangerous nature and, consequently, deserves no more place in modern thought than does any other crudity promulgated by well meaning but ignorant men.

[3] "Spiritualism Among Civilized and Savage Races." Edward Lawrence. London: 1921. A. and C. Black, Ltd. 16mo., pp. xiii, 112.

Some ten years ago J. R. Meader and Hereward Carrington published a work in England upon the subject of "Death." The present work[4] is an abridgement of it with such additional matter as is necessitated by recent researches. The bulk of the book, Part I, is devoted to the physiological aspects of death: the much smaller Part II deals with the psychological. The author presents an extensive bibliography, as "the great adventure" has had a host of chroniclers and has been discussed from a hundred points of view. His discussion is of extraordinary interest. He fully considers such subjects as the moment of death, the causes of death, the signs of death and conditions simulating death. Many curious and interesting facts are brought out and all are presented fully, but with no purpose of emphasizing the uncanny and gruesome. The difficulty in determining that death has really come, especially in those cases where its coming is sudden, is strongly emphasized. Only the beginning of decomposition can be considered certain evidence and bodies should not be disposed of until it occurs. That many cases of premature burial occur is sustained by our author and he urges the utmost care in determining that death has really come. He considers the different methods of disposing of the dead and regards cremation as desirable. The question of the resurrection of the body is touched upon and dismissed. Naturally, Hereward Carrington could not write a book upon this theme without a discussion of its spiritual side. He, however, takes up less than one-third of his book with this. He sketches the theories of immortality that have been proposed at different times and places—philosophical, theological, and those of unguided and untrained reason. He ends with what he calls "the testimony of science, physical research." His attitude is fairly stated in the words: "The Problem of Death—the Mystery of the Ages—the Riddle of the Sphinx—is likely to remain unsolved so long as science deals with *phenomena* merely; only when we deal with *noumena*—the innermost nature of things in themselves—will this problem ever be solved in the true sense of the word." One need not agree with Dr. Carrington in detail, or with his fundamental purpose in writing this book, to find it a volume of extraordinary interest.

FREDERICK STARR.

[4] "Death: Its Causes and Phenomena." With special reference to Immortality. Hereward Carrington. New York: 1921. Dodd, Mead and Co. 16mo., pp. viii, 307.

FAITH—HOPE—LOVE.

Our faith is in the Infinite
And in the eternal will!
His life is ours, though from his way
We stray and wander still.
Life's lesson then of needs must be
The Truth that teaches Harmony.

We hope! For men have e'er aspired,
Have risen and attained!
What one alone can never reach
Together shall be gained,
And more and more is understood
The meaning of man's brotherhood.

We love! And love of self led on
By Reason must embrace
All life and more and most of all,
The God-like human race!
Then heed the thought by Truth still given,
That love of God and man is Heaven.

WALTER DANIEL.

THE FIELD.

"The World is my country, to do good is my Religion"

NEWS OF INDIA.

The effectiveness of the campaign of boycott of everything British in India, particularly British goods in India, has created such an impression upon the official and unofficial circle of England that some are already demanding that Earl Reading be asked to resign from his position as Viceroy of India. The boycott of the Prince of Wales and riots in various parts of India, particularly in Madras, where all the Indian police force resigned from the British Police to boycott the Prince, has made the British authorities very nervous. The Viceroy of India has adopted the methods of coercion and concession in the same breath to terrorize the country and to win the Moderate elements with the government.

The government's latest attempt at stopping the Non-co-operation Movement has failed. Earl Reading through the Moderate leaders, such as Pundit Madan Mohan Malavaya, tried to have a Round Table Discussion with Mahatma M. K. Gandhi, the Chief Executive of the All India National Congress which is the official mouth-piece of the Indian nationalists. Gandhi was asked to stop boycotting and other activities of the Non-co-operation Movement as the first condition of the Conference at the last session of the All India National Congress, held in Ahamadabad during the Christmas week of 1921. Gandhi was vested with chief executive authority of the Congress with the limitation that he would not make any peace with the government without the sanction of the Congress. Gandhi, consistent with the mandate of the people, refused to participate in the Round Table Conference and demanded that the Government must first release all the political prisoners in India—they number no less than 20,000—unconditionally. The conference of all the party leaders of India held in Bombay has been broken up because of Gandhi's firm stand on the matter.

The people of India have begun to practice civil disobedience and thus refuse to pay taxes to the government. This will completely undermine the authority of an alien state without striking a blow. But the British government in its desperation will put more people in jail and will use all the machines of repression to destroy the movement. This will add fuel to the fire of revolt which is in an explosive condition. Already the people are demanding that a Republic of the United States of India be formally declared in India and that the coming era of more intensified repression will hasten the day for its inauguration is certain.

TARAKNATH DAS,
International Secretary,
Friends of Freedom for India.

The Community Pulpit

A Series of twenty (20) sermons by the Ministers of The Community Church of New York. Subscription $2.00 per year; single copies 10 cents. Address Secretary, 61 East 34th Street, New York City.

SERIES 1921-1922

Rebuilding the World. (*Holmes.*)
Can Our Religion Stand the Test of Facts? (*Randall.*)
What Can We Expect from the Disarmament Conference at Washington? (*Randall.*)
The Community Church: Why It Is Hated and Loved. (*Holmes.*)
A Delegate from the Kingdom of God Arrives at the Disarmament Conference. (*Holmes.*)
Is the World Ready for Spiritual Disarmament? (*Randall.*)
The Novitiate of Service. (*Holmes.*)
The Wandering Jew. (*Randall.*)
The Tide in the Affairs of Men: Is It Turning? (*Holmes.*)

EARLIER SERMONS STILL AVAILABLE

Does God Know His Own Mind? (*Holmes.*)
The Price of Peace: Are We Willing to Pay It? (*Holmes.*)
The Community Church: Its Principles, Organization, Message and Work. (*Holmes.*)
The Great Society: How Long Can It Wear Its Old Garments? (*Randall.*)
What God Means to Me. (*Holmes.*)
As an Age Thinketh, So Is It. (*Randall.*)
The Real Jesus (*Randall*) and Jesus the Revolutionist (*Holmes*).
A New Vision of Life as Service. (*Randall.*)
A New Spiritual Consciousness of Unity. (*Randall.*)
The Realization of God as Creative Life. (*Randall.*)
A New Faith in Humanity as Invincible. (*Randall.*)
Men, Women and Ideals: Parents and Children. (*Holmes.*)
Sociological Aspects of the Community Church. (*Brown.*)
Is There Any Evidence for Immortality? (*Holmes.*)
Should America Disarm Now? (*Randall.*)
Can We Hope to Change Human Nature? (*Randall.*)

It's a "Case" of Necessity

Your Printing will be above criticism if done by

THE OAKLAND PRESS

728 E. 39th Street
Phone Douglas 244

The Tenant Farmer

In its February issue will contain an article on "Why Abraham Lincoln Rejected Christianity."

A paper published monthly. 25c a year. Room 414, 35 S. Dearborn St. Chicago

Phone Oakland 489 **JANITORS' SUPPLIES**

Everything in HARDWARE

AT

PORTER'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

DREXEL State Bank

Cottage Grove Ave. *and* Oakwood Blvd.

Thirty-two years of conservative banking, combined with service and courtesy for every depositor —large or small—is the record of this bank . . . . . .

Your savings and checking account cordially invited

Resources Six and one-half Million Dollars

Schumann & Company

Cleaners of

FANCY GOWNS AND KID GLOVES

Having winter garments cleaned before storing them will keep out moth

PHONE DREXEL 221
ALL DEPARTMENTS

MAIN OFFICE AND WORK:
3954 Cottage Grove Avenue

The Blakely-Oswald Printing Co.

PRINTERS and BINDERS

Telephone Wabash 3854 120-124 W. Polk St., CHICAGO

The Jazz of Patriotism

An Anti-War Play

By FANNY BIXBY SPENCER

Published by
Geo. W. Moyle Pub. Co.
337 E. Third St., Long Beach, Calif.

Price 50 cents

Order from publisher or from
Fanny Bixby Spencer,
Costa Mesa, Orange Co., Calif.

Your book is altogether the most compelling and convicting exhibit of the unchristian character of the ordinary church reaction to war I have ever read. It is an invaluable contribution to the study of war hysteria. ROBERT WHITAKER.

DUTY TO CIVILIZATION

A Pamphlet answering many questions as to the causes of the Great War, written by FRANCIS NEILSON, author of "How Diplomats Make War," etc., Editor of *The Freeman* and Associate Editor of UNITY.

"I consider that the effort which Mr. Neilson makes in this pamphlet to establish the truth touching the origins of the war is among the most notable I have yet encountered. Without such clarifying labors given to the destruction of intolerable myths we can not hope to bring our civilization back to sanity and order. No one I know is facing the forces of chaos so heroically as Mr. Neilson."
FERDINAND SCHEVILL, University of Chicago.

Published by the
UNITY PUBLISHING COMPANY
Price, 30 Cents **700 Oakwood Boulevard, CHICAGO**
Reprinted from UNITY

WRIGHT & COMPANY
STEAM—DOMESTIC
COAL
TELEPHONE WABASH 5028
Main Office:
28 E. Jackson Blvd.
CHICAGO

Bowman Dairy Company

MILK BOTTLED IN THE COUNTRY

Milk Cream Butter Buttermilk

DO OUR WAGONS SERVE YOU?
WHY NOT HAVE THE BEST?

4221-4229 State Street Telephones at all Division Offices

EVANSTON CHICAGO OAK PARK

Subscribe for and Read UNITY—Do it Now!

Price 1/- **Price 1/-**

The Economics of Reparation

By J. A. HOBSON

Author of "Democracy After the War," "Problems of a New World"

An exposure of the violation of pre-armistice pledges in the reparation terms of the Versailles Treaty and of the injurious, unjust, and self-contradictory policy of the recent Ultimatum demands and Sanctions.

Published by GEORGE ALLEN & UNWIN, Ltd., Ruskin House, 40 Museum Street, W. C. 1

Also obtainable from The U. D. C., Orchard House, Gt. Smith Street, S. W. 1